

# **GEO**

## **GUYANA ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES**

### **Results of a 2001 Client Satisfaction Survey For Go-Invest**

*Prepared by:*

**Casey Hanewall**

*Submitted by:*

**Chemonics International Inc.**

*In association with*

**Management Systems International, Inc**

*To:*

**United States Agency for International Development  
Georgetown, Guyana**

Under Contract No. 504-C-00-99-00009-00

**January 2002**

Technical Report No. 36

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
Executive Summary	iii
I. Background	1
II. Results of 1999 Client Survey	1
III. Methodology	2
A. Development of Questionnaire	2
B. Selection of Participants	2
C. Difficulties Encountered	4
D. Compilation of Data	5
IV. Survey Results	6
A. Summary of Findings	6
B. Respondent Characteristics	9
C. Sector of Economy Targeted by Clients	11
D. Type of Assistance or Information Requested	11
E. Quality of Export and Investment Assistance	13
F. Quality of Assistance in Helping Clients Obtain Land or Concessions	17
G. Level of Staff Responsiveness	23
H. Use of GO-INVEST Resources	25
I. Benefits and Effectiveness of Working with GO-INVEST	25
V. Respondent Commentary	30
Annex A 2001 Client Satisfaction Questionnaire	A-1
Annex B 2001 Client Satisfaction Questionnaire for Trade Fair Attendees	B-1
Annex C Specific Follow-up Items Requested by Respondents	C-1
Annex D List of Respondents Interested in Participating in Focus Groups on GO-INVEST Services	D-1
Annex E Recommended Changes for Future GO-INVEST Client Surveys	E-1

## List of Tables

Table 1	Number of Staff Employed by Respondent Companies	10
Table 2	Annual Sales of Respondent Companies	10
Table 3	Location of Headquarters of Respondent Companies	10
Table 4	Sectors Targeted by Investors Requesting GO-INVEST Assistance	11
Table 5	Export Information/Assistance Requested	12
Table 6	Investment Information/Assistance Requested	13
Table 7	Efficiency of Export Information/Assistance Provided	14
Table 8	Quality of Export Information/Assistance Provided	14
Table 9	Level of Professionalism of Staff Providing Export Information/ Assistance	15
Table 10	Quality of Available Export-related Resources	15
Table 11	Efficiency of Investment Information/Assistance Provided	15
Table 12	Quality of Investment Information/Assistance Provided	16
Table 13	Level of Professionalism of Staff Providing Investment Information/ Assistance	16
Table 14	Quality of Available Investment-related Resources	17
Table 15	Outcome of Requests for Land and/or Factory Space	19
Table 16	Quality of Assistance Concerning Requests for Land and/or Factory Space	19
Table 17	Status of Applications for Land and/or Factory Space	20
Table 18	Average Amount of Time to Process Requests for Land and/or Factory Space	20
Table 19	Outcome of Requests for Duty-free Concessions	20
Table 20	Quality of Assistance Concerning Requests for Duty-free Concessions	21
Table 21	Status of Applications for Duty-free Concessions	21
Table 22	Average Amount of Time to Process Requests for Duty-free Concessions	21
Table 23	Outcome of Requests for Discretionary Concessions	22
Table 24	Quality of Assistance Concerning Requests for Discretionary Concessions	22
Table 25	Status of Applications for Discretionary Concessions	23
Table 26	Average Amount of Time to Process Requests for Discretionary Concessions	23
Table 27	Feedback on Staff Responsiveness	24
Table 28	Utilization of Web Site and Printed Materials	25
Table 29	Ability of GO-INVEST to Meet Client Needs	27
Table 30	Benefits of GO-INVEST Assistance	28
Table 31	Overall Score Given to GO-INVEST	29
Table 32	Desire to Work with GO-INVEST Again	29

## Executive Summary

In January 2002 the U.S. Agency of International Development-funded Guyana Economic Opportunities (GEO) program conducted a client satisfaction survey of businesses assisted throughout 2001 by the Guyana Office for Investment (GO-INVEST). The purpose of the exercise was to provide GO-INVEST with detailed client feedback so that the agency could analyze the quality of its services and staff. The data will enable GO-INVEST to understand the advancements it has made since an initial survey was conducted in 1999. Moreover, this information will allow GO-INVEST to determine the ways in which it can continue to improve its services.

Two questionnaires were developed and distributed to 93 domestic or foreign companies. These questionnaires solicited feedback on a variety of issues, including, but not limited to: the types of assistance requested; the responsiveness and professionalism of staff; the benefits derived from GO-INVEST assistance; and the quality of services provided.

Forty-seven (47) companies, representing 51% of firms having received a questionnaire, responded to the survey. Of this total, 44 were domestic companies and 3 were foreign investors. Following are the key findings resulting from the survey:

- Companies of all sizes requested GO-INVEST assistance. Although 39% of respondents employ 10 or fewer employees, clients completing the survey employ from as few as 1 to more than 1,000 staff. Respondents indicated earnings ranging from less than G\$250,000 to more than G\$5 billion.
- The total number of foreign clients assisted by GO-INVEST was substantially less than in 1999. Possible causes for this decrease include the 2001 national elections and the disturbances that followed and the global economic turndown and the terrorist attacks of September 11. Notwithstanding the drop in the total number of foreign firms assisted, foreign investors gave higher average scores to GO-INVEST than domestic firms.
- Companies requesting GO-INVEST assistance most frequently sought investment in the handicrafts, manufacturing, and agriculture/fishing sectors. These three sectors were the focus of 75% of all client requests.
- Respondents requested assistance in an average of four topics. The five most commonly requested types of assistance, ranked in order, were: information on foreign trade fairs/expositions; assistance in conducting a trade mission abroad (usually to attend a trade fair); assistance in acquiring duty-free concessions; assistance in acquiring land and/or factory space; and assistance in acquiring other discretionary incentives. The types of services requested also represents a dramatic change from 1999, at which time GO-INVEST did not provide assistance to exporters, and 97% of all clients had requested assistance in liaising with other Government ministries and agencies.

- Ninety-four percent (94%) of respondents rank the overall quality of GO-INVEST services as satisfactory or better. On a five-point scale, where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor, the average score given was 2 (above average). The average score given by domestic respondents was 2 (above average), whereas the average score given by foreign investors was 1.7 (between excellent and above average). These mean scores represent a notable increase from the results of the 1999 survey, when the average score was 3.4 (between satisfactory and below average) for all respondents; 3.6 (between satisfactory and below average) for domestic companies; and 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory) for foreign investors.
- GO-INVEST received slightly higher scores for the quality of its export assistance than for its investment assistance. The average score given concerning export assistance was 2.3 (between above average and satisfactory) compared to 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory) for investment assistance.
- Respondents felt that GO-INVEST provided slightly more timely assistance in the area of export promotion than in investment promotion. Overall, 77% of clients—75% in the case of domestic firms and 100% in the case of foreign firms—interviewed felt that they had received timely assistance. Eighty-three percent (83%) of companies requesting export assistance felt that GO-INVEST provided services in a timely manner, compared to 67% for investment services. These scores represent a notable increase from the 1999 survey, when only 12% of local clients felt that services were provided in a timely manner.
- GO-INVEST clients indicated that they believe the agency's staff to be highly professional. The average score on the five-point scale given to all staff was 2 (above average), with an average score of 2.1 (between above average and satisfactory) given by domestic clients and 2 (above average) by foreign firms. The average score given to export-promotion staff was 1.9 (between excellent and above average); 94% of respondents felt that export-promotion staff ranked satisfactory or higher in terms of professionalism. The average score given to investment-promotion staff was 2.2 (between above average and satisfactory), with 83% of respondents giving a ranking of satisfactory or above. This also depicts a strong improvement from 1999, when only 38% of local clients considered the professionalism of staff to be adequate.
- Regarding requests for the acquisition of land, the average score given for the quality of services provided by GO-INVEST was 2.2 (between above average and satisfactory); 100% of respondents gave a score of satisfactory or above in this category. The average scores given by foreign and domestic investors were 1.5 (between excellent and above average) and 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory), respectively. These scores compare favorably with the 1999 survey, when the overall average score was 3.4 (between satisfactory and below average); 2.6 (between above average and satisfactory) for foreign investors; and 3.5 (between satisfactory and below average) for local businesses.

- For companies requesting duty-free concessions, the average score was 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory). The percentage of respondents providing a score of satisfactory or above was 76%, notably lower than in the case of land. The average scores given by foreign and domestic investors were 2.3 and 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory in both cases), respectively. Similar to the case of land, these scores also represented an increase since 1999, when the mean scores given were: 3.4 (between satisfactory and below average) overall; 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory) for foreign firms; and 4 (below average) for domestic firms.
- For firms requesting other discretionary concessions, the average score was 2.6 (between above average and satisfactory), the lowest score for any ranked category. Eight-five percent (85%) of all respondents gave a score of satisfactory or better. The average scores given by foreign and domestic investors were 2.7 and 2.6 (between above average and satisfactory in both cases), respectively. These respective figures were also the lowest mean scores given by both foreign and domestic investors in any category.
- According to those firms interviewed, the timeliness of the decision-making process concerning the granting of land and concessions has improved greatly, particularly for domestic clients. Of the survey participants that had requested land, 8, or 62%, had received the land they requested while 5 await a final decision. No respondent claimed to have had a request for land rejected. Of those that received their land—all of which were domestic clients—such investors claim to have received approval for their request within 7.3 months, on average; those that have a decision pending note an average waiting time of 7 months. This figure compares to a mean waiting time of over one year (for domestic firms) reported in 1999. Regarding duty-free concessions, 7 respondents—39% in all—had requests fully approved; 3 had requests partially approved; 3 were not awarded concessions; and 5 await a decision. According to those firms interviewed, requests were granted within 2.1 months, on average, for all clients; within 1.6 months for local firms; and within 4.5 months for foreign investors. Those firms that await a decision claim to have been awaiting an average of 6.8 months for a response. This contrasts notably with the 1999 results, when, in the case of domestic clients, the average time required to receive duty-free concessions was 12.8 months (compared to 4.3 months for foreign investors). Of the firms interviewed that requested other discretionary concessions, 4 respondents, or 31%, were granted their request; 8—representing nearly two-thirds of all respondents—requests are pending; and 1 solicitation was not granted. Approved requests took an average of 3.8 months, with domestic firms claiming an average wait of 3.5 months and foreign investors, 5 months. Surprisingly, those awaiting a decision—which represents the majority of cases—claim to have been waiting an average of 10.8 months. In 1999, the average time to process other discretionary concessions was 11 months for domestic firms and 4 months for foreign companies. The disappearance of the discrepancies between foreign and domestic investors in waiting times since 1999 demonstrates that GO-INVEST has taken considerable measures to ensure equal treatment for both foreign and domestic clients. In fact, most domestic investors now face a shorter waiting period than foreign firms.

- Few local businesses utilized GO-INVEST's web site or printed materials; many noted that they were not aware the agency had a web site. Just 15% of local businesses claim to have visited the web site, and only 5% indicated that they had used GO-INVEST publications. These figures compare to foreign investor utilization rates of 100% and 67% of the web site and written documents, respectively. The low domestic utilization rates indicate the need to better publicize these resources.
- Notwithstanding the improvement in most scores, very few businesses indicated that they had experienced an increase in sales, employment, or exports as a result of GO-INVEST assistance. This fact could be the result of one of three factors: the investments facilitated by GO-INVEST were economically unproductive; the investments are still too new to have generated such benefits; or businesses are unable to calculate these increases.

In addition to the numerical data highlighted above, companies that responded to the survey were asked to provide recommendations on possible GO-INVEST improvements. The key recommendations, all of which were noted by three or more respondents, are as follows:

- Strengthen GO-INVEST's mandate vis-à-vis other Government ministries, particularly concerning its role in awarding concessions and land.
- Hire additional employees to help overworked GO-INVEST staff.
- Continue to improve the timeliness and responsiveness of staff.
- Provide more frequent updates to those businesses waiting for decisions concerning requests for land or concessions.
- Ensure that clients are provided with lease paperwork in a timely manner, particularly for factory space at Eccles.
- Indicate to those businesses not receiving land or concessions why their requests were not approved.
- Hold regular meetings with investors to discuss major issues and to address needed changes in GO-INVEST's services.
- Provide interested businesses with an annual calendar of trade fairs early each year.
- Provide more assistance to businesses once they have arrived at trade fairs.
- Develop better investor-targeting programs to attract high-quality foreign investment to Guyana.

## **I. Background**

The Guyana Economic Opportunities (GEO) Project is a five-year project that is being funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and is being implemented by Chemonics International of Washington, D.C.

GEO's overall goal is to help the Government of Guyana create an improved climate for private investment. As a primary means of accomplishing this goal, GEO is providing assistance to the Guyana Office for Investment (GO-INVEST) to improve this agency's capacities. GO-INVEST is the Government agency tasked with increasing investment in and exports from Guyana.

The purpose of the surveying exercise was to provide GO-INVEST with detailed client feedback so that the agency could analyze the perceived quality of its services and staff. Such data will enable GO-INVEST to understand the advancements it has made since an initial survey was conducted in 1999. Further, this information will allow GO-INVEST to determine the ways in which it can continue to improve its services.

## **II. Results of 1999 Client Survey**

The GO-INVEST survey carried out in 1999 demonstrated that very few businesses—with the exception of foreign investors—felt that GO-INVEST was doing an adequate job. Some of the highlights of the initial survey include:

- Thirty-seven (37) of 63 companies that contacted GO-INVEST in 1999 responded to the questionnaire. Thirty (30), or 81%, of the respondents were Guyanese businesses, while seven (7), or 19%, were foreign investors.
- Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the businesses that had approached GO-INVEST did so to request assistance liaising with other government agencies, primarily to acquire leases for government-owned land or factory space, or to obtain duty-free or other discretionary concessions.
- A large number of local businesses were disappointed with the services provided by GO-INVEST: 63% did not feel that services were provided in an adequate fashion. Further, 62% of local firms interviewed considered the professionalism of GO-INVEST staff to be inadequate. Overall, local investors gave GO-INVEST a mean rating of 3.6 (between satisfactory and below average).
- In comparison to local investors, foreign investors gave a mean rating of 2.4 (between satisfactory and above average) to GO-INVEST.
- The decision-making process concerning land, duty-free concessions, and other discretionary concessions took an average of 14.7 months, 12.8 months, and 11 months, respectively, for local clients. For foreign investors, the relevant figures were 7.6 months, 4.3 months, and 4 months, respectively.



- A large discrepancy existed between the ability of local and foreign investors to have their requests granted by GO-INVEST. Only 28% of local investors had their requests for land granted, whereas the figure rose to 60% for foreign investors.

The above findings demonstrated that GO-INVEST had a very poor reputation among most Guyanese businesses, with a substantially higher approval rating demonstrated by foreign investors. Further, the 1999 survey demonstrated that GO-INVEST did not provide timely assistance in most cases. The key recommendations provided by interviewees included the need to enhance the professionalism of GO-INVEST staff, improve the timeliness of assistance provided by GO-INVEST, and clarify the role of GO-INVEST vis-à-vis other Government agencies.

### **III. Survey Methodology**

#### **A. Development of Questionnaire**

To conduct the 2001 GO-INVEST client satisfaction survey, the 1999 survey results, questionnaire and findings were analyzed in detail. At the same time, GEO solicited the feedback of the GO-INVEST Chief Executive Officer (CEO) regarding the information GO-INVEST required from the 2001 survey. By comparing the CEO's suggestions with the original survey, a new survey was devised that was substantially longer than the original survey: eight pages in the revised survey versus five in the original questionnaire. A key reason for the longer length of the revised survey was the need to address the export-promotion aspects of GO-INVEST's operations, which was an area for which GO-INVEST held no responsibility until late 1999, and as a result was not included in the original survey. The revised questionnaire used for the 2001 exercise is included in Annex A.

#### **B. Selection of Participants**

In addition to receiving feedback on the questionnaire to be used in conducting the survey, GO-INVEST's CEO provided a comprehensive list of 2001 clients, which numbered around 140 businesses and individuals. Additionally, each GO-INVEST investment officer was requested to submit their own client lists, so that each officer's lists could be compared against the master list. Once all lists were received, each GO-INVEST investment officer was interviewed so that each of the 140 clients could be analyzed for their appropriateness in participating in the survey. These interviews were used to ascertain the following about each client:

- The purpose behind each client's interaction with GO-INVEST;
- The current status of all requests for assistance; and
- Possible justifications to eliminate specific clients from the survey.

Upon meeting with each investment officer, approximately 40 of the 140 companies included on the master contact list were discarded for one or more of the following reasons:

- *Unknown clients.* In many cases investment officers were unfamiliar with an individual listed on the master contact sheet. In certain cases, it appears that the GO-INVEST CEO had recently held an initial meeting, oftentimes informally, with investors that were subsequently included on the master contact sheet, although the clients had not yet been passed to an investment officer for further assistance.
- *Insufficient contact.* A number of individuals listed on the master contact sheet, primarily foreign investors, had been in contact with GO-INVEST once or twice, but then failed to follow-up with GO-INVEST in order to advance their inquiry further.<sup>1</sup> As a result, GO-INVEST in effect did not assist such businesses in a detailed fashion. These companies were eliminated since they would have been unable to provide responses to most questions included in the questionnaire.
- *Unrelated business difficulties.* The requests of several local businesses are on hold indefinitely due to issues such as lawsuits and foreclosures. As a result, GO-INVEST has been unable to process their requests for the acquisition of leases on Government-owned land or for duty-free or discretionary concessions.
- *Timing of request.* A number of businesses had contacted GO-INVEST a matter of days or weeks prior to the commencement of the survey. As a result, GO-INVEST was in the initial stages of providing assistance to such firms. These businesses would thus have been unable to provide responses to most parts of the questionnaires.<sup>2</sup>
- *Repeat information.* A number of contacts included on the master list had been recorded more than once.

The interviews with GO-INVEST's investment officers also led to an important realization: the need to create a second questionnaire for those businesses that GO-INVEST had assisted in attending trade fairs abroad. These clients were in many cases encouraged to attend trade fairs as a result of their attendance at GO-INVEST-sponsored seminars, in addition to other proactive efforts conducted by GO-INVEST. Thus, the original survey, which was geared towards those businesses that had approached GO-INVEST for one or more reasons, was not appropriate for the businesses that were targeted by the agency. Because the assistance provided by GO-INVEST to businesses wishing to attending trade fairs abroad represents a substantial portion of the overall work

---

<sup>1</sup> The events of September 11 caused several foreign investors to terminate their request for assistance from GO-INVEST during the early phases of their interactions with the agency, in at least one case due to an international travel moratorium.

<sup>2</sup> In a few cases businesses that contacted GO-INVEST for assistance in December 2001 were sent a questionnaire. Several such businesses declined to participate due to the reasoning used for disqualifying other similar businesses from participating in the survey: they felt that they had had insufficient contact with GO-INVEST to be able to rate the institution's services fairly.

conducted by the agency at present—approximately one-third of all clients—it was deemed necessary to create a second questionnaire rather than eliminate these companies altogether. The second questionnaire, called the “trade-fair survey” for the purposes of this report, was much shorter than the full survey, seeing that most questions in the full survey were relevant only to those businesses that independently approached GO-INVEST for assistance. The trade-fair questionnaire is attached as Annex B.

All of the 100 clients chosen for the exercise were provided with either the regular survey or the trade-fair survey. Only two companies were in the position to receive both questionnaires, in which case the most appropriate of the two surveys was forwarded, based upon discussions held with GO-INVEST staff. Of this total pool of potential interviewees, GEO was unable to deliver approximately 10% of the surveys, due to one or more of the following reasons:

- The business had moved, and no forwarding address could be found;
- The business had ceased operations; or
- The contact information provided by GO-INVEST only included a telephone or fax number which was no longer in service.

Although it would have been preferable to test both surveys with a pilot group of companies to ascertain whether the questionnaires needed any adjustments, the need to receive responses quickly did not provide for the time required to conduct such a test. Suggestions concerning alterations to be made to both questionnaires prior to conducting a future survey are highlighted in Annex E.

Every company or individual that received a copy of the questionnaire was contacted by telephone three or more times during the course of two weeks in order to encourage their participation in the survey. All participants, with the exception of those firms located in remote areas of Guyana or abroad, were given the opportunity to have the survey conducted in person by a GEO consultant. Twenty-three (23) respondents, or 49% of all participants of the exercise, chose to be interviewed in person. The remaining respondents submitted surveys via fax or mail.

### **C. Difficulties Encountered**

There were certain difficulties faced in conducting the survey, which were similar to those problems encountered during the 1999 survey. The key difficulties included:

- *Incorrect contact information.* In addition to those firms that could not be contacted at all, the contact information provided by GO-INVEST for approximately one-fifth of the companies that received the questionnaire had changed, and correct information had to be tracked down through a variety of means.
- *Difficulty in contacting individuals.* Most businesses had to be contacted two or more times before the individual who had received the survey could be contacted directly. In some cases, businesses were visited in person when an individual could not be

reached by telephone. Nearly 5% of those individuals that had received the survey were traveling outside the country and could not participate in the survey.<sup>3</sup>

- *Delays in receiving information.* Several companies claimed to have completed questionnaires and provided them directly to GO-INVEST that were never found. In these cases, the companies had to be urged to re-do the surveys. Some individuals claiming to have already completed and mailed the survey were reluctant to repeat the exercise.
- *Inability to properly explain the purpose of the survey.* A number of respondents to the survey did not understand that the GEO project was independent from GO-INVEST, notwithstanding the information provided in a detailed cover letter prepared by GO-INVEST's CEO. Thus, a number of companies were requesting additional agency support from the surveyor despite being told that the survey was being done independently of GO-INVEST. These individuals, upon discovering the true purpose of the exercise, were often unable—or unwilling—to complete the questionnaire.

In addition to the above issues, there was a general problem posed by the high number of questions included in the full questionnaire. In general, such a long questionnaire inhibits a large number of companies from responding, due to the time required to complete the survey.<sup>4</sup> However, creating a shorter questionnaire was not a possibility. Most GO-INVEST clients are domestic investors that frequently ask GO-INVEST for many types of information relating to both investment and exporting. Rather than send out multiple surveys on separate GO-INVEST services to individual firms, and thus run the risk of having many companies fill out one questionnaire and not another, it was considered more appropriate to include as much information as possible in one survey and subsequently contact each company to urge them to complete the questionnaire. Overall, this issue points to the growing complexity of GO-INVEST's range of services, and speaks to the wide array of issues that GO-INVEST must tackle on a daily basis.

#### **D. Compilation of Data**

The findings of the survey were recorded so that, in addition to being able to tally the frequency of responses to simple "yes" or "no" questions, an average score could be determined for those questions that requested respondents to provide a rank between one and five.<sup>5</sup> Those questions that resulted in such a numerical rank included the following:

- Quality of service provided in the area of export information or services.
- Professionalism of staff serving clients in the area of export information or services.

---

<sup>3</sup> In general, when a contact was out of the country, that person's co-workers felt uncomfortable completing the questionnaire in their stead without direct permission, which most individuals were unable to obtain.

<sup>4</sup> As proof for this point, 69% of those businesses receiving the three-page trade-fair survey submitted completed questionnaires, compared to 40% of those firms that received the eight-page survey.

<sup>5</sup> Scores were given the following value: 1 = excellent; 2 = above average; 3 = satisfactory; 4 = below average; 5 = poor.

- Quality of documentation provided to clients in the area of export information or services.
- Overall quality of service provided in the area of investment information or services.
- Professionalism of staff serving clients in the area of investment information or services.
- Quality of documentation provided to clients in the area of investment information or services.
- Quality of assistance provided in assisting clients wishing to acquire leases on Government-owned land and/or factory space.
- Quality of assistance provided in assisting clients wishing to acquire duty-free concessions.<sup>6</sup>
- Quality of assistance provided in assisting clients wishing to acquire other discretionary concessions.<sup>6</sup>
- Overall ranking of services provided by GO-INVEST.<sup>7</sup>

Final data have been presented in this report not only as aggregate numbers, but also organized according to domestic and foreign investor categories. The results have enabled comparisons with the 1999 survey, in addition to the creation of several conclusions and recommendations concerning GO-INVEST's operations. Finally, several specific actions about which respondents requested GO-INVEST to contact them were identified in the survey; these actions are included in Annex C.

## **IV. Survey Results**

### **A. Summary of Findings**

This section provides the results of the survey, presented in tabular form. Where necessary, tables are supported by further explanations or analysis.

Tables 1-32 present information provided by the 47 respondents. Of these respondents, 44, or 94%, represent domestic companies, while 3, or 6%, represent foreign investors. Of the domestic respondents, 24, or 55%, responded to the trade-fair questionnaire.

The key findings culled from the data gathered from the survey are as follows:

- Companies of all sizes requested GO-INVEST assistance. Although 39% of respondents employ 10 or fewer employees, clients completing the survey employ from as few as 1 to more than 1,000 staff. Respondents indicated earnings ranging from less than G\$250,000 to more than G\$5 billion.

---

<sup>6</sup> Other discretionary concessions include benefits such as tax holidays.

<sup>7</sup> This category was included, in addition to the questions requesting a score for the quality of investment- or export-specific assistance, to determine an overall satisfaction ranking. In some cases where businesses requested both export and investment information scores varied from one area to the other, and thus it was felt necessary to request each respondent to provide an overall ranking that would encompass every aspect of their interaction with GO-INVEST.

- The total number of foreign clients assisted by GO-INVEST was substantially less than in 1999. Possible causes for this decrease include the 2001 national elections and the disturbances that followed and the global economic turndown and the terrorist attacks of September 11. Notwithstanding the drop in the total number of foreign firms assisted, foreign investors gave higher average scores to GO-INVEST than domestic firms.
- Companies requesting GO-INVEST assistance most frequently sought investment in the handicrafts, manufacturing, and agriculture/fishing sectors. These three sectors were the focus of 75% of all client requests.
- Respondents requested assistance in an average of four topics. The five most commonly requested types of assistance, ranked in order, were: information on foreign trade fairs/expositions; assistance in conducting a trade mission abroad (usually to attend a trade fair); assistance in acquiring duty-free concessions; assistance in acquiring land and/or factory space; and assistance in acquiring other discretionary incentives. The types of services requested also represents a dramatic change from 1999, at which time GO-INVEST did not provide assistance to exporters, and 97% of all clients requested had assistance in liaising with other Government ministries.
- Ninety-four percent (94%) of respondents rank the overall quality of GO-INVEST services as satisfactory or better. On a five-point scale, where 1 is excellent and 5 is poor, the average score given was 2 (above average). The average score given by domestic respondents was 2 (above average), whereas the average score given by foreign investors was 1.7 (between excellent and above average). These mean scores represent a notable increase from the results of the 1999 survey, when the average score was 3.4 (between satisfactory and below average) for all respondents; 3.6 (between satisfactory and below average) for domestic companies; and 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory) for foreign investors.
- GO-INVEST received slightly higher scores for the quality of its export assistance than for its investment assistance. The average score given concerning export assistance was 2.3 (between above average and satisfactory) compared to 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory) for investment assistance.
- Respondents felt that GO-INVEST provided slightly more timely assistance in the area of export promotion than in investment promotion. Overall, 77% of clients—75% in the case of domestic firms and 100% in the case of foreign firms—interviewed felt that they had received timely assistance. Eighty-three percent (83%) of companies requesting export assistance felt that GO-INVEST provided services in a timely manner, compared to 67% for investment services. These scores represent a notable increase from the 1999 survey, when only 12% of local clients felt that services were provided in a timely manner.

- GO-INVEST clients indicated that they believe the agency's staff to be highly professional. The average score on the five-point scale given to all staff was 2 (above average), with an average score of 2.1 (between above average and satisfactory) given by domestic clients and 2 (above average) by foreign firms. The average score given to export-promotion staff was 1.9 (between excellent and above average); 94% of respondents felt that export-promotion staff ranked satisfactory or higher in terms of professionalism. The average score given to investment-promotion staff was 2.2 (between above average and satisfactory), with 83% of respondents giving a ranking of satisfactory or above. This also depicts a strong improvement from 1999, when only 38% of local clients considered the professionalism of staff to be adequate.
- Regarding requests for the acquisition of land, the average score given for the quality of services provided by GO-INVEST was 2.2 (between above average and satisfactory); 100% of respondents gave a score of satisfactory or above in this category. The average scores given by foreign and domestic investors were 1.5 (between excellent and above average) and 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory), respectively. These scores compare favorably with the 1999 survey, when the overall average score was 3.4 (between satisfactory and below average); 2.6 (between above average and satisfactory) for foreign investors; and 3.5 (between satisfactory and below average) for local businesses.
- For companies requesting duty-free concessions, the average score was 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory). The percentage of respondents providing a score of satisfactory or above was 76%, notably lower than in the case of land. The average scores given by foreign and domestic investors were 2.3 and 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory in both cases), respectively. Similar to the case of land, these scores also represented an increase since 1999, when the mean scores given were: 3.4 (between satisfactory and below average) overall; 2.4 (between above average and satisfactory) for foreign firms; and 4 (below average) for domestic firms.
- For firms requesting other discretionary concessions, the average score was 2.6 (between above average and satisfactory), the lowest score for any ranked category. Eight-five percent (85%) of all respondents gave a score of satisfactory or better. The average scores given by foreign and domestic investors were 2.7 and 2.6 (between above average and satisfactory in both cases), respectively. These respective figures were also the lowest mean scores given by both foreign and domestic investors in any category.
- According to those firms interviewed, the timeliness of the decision-making process concerning the granting of land and concessions has improved greatly, particularly for domestic clients. Of the survey participants that had requested land, 8, or 62%, had received the land they requested while 5 await a final decision. No respondent claimed to have had a request for land rejected. Of those that received their land—all of which were domestic clients—such investors claim to have received approval for their request within 7.3 months, on average; those that have a decision pending note an average waiting time of 7 months. This figure compares to a mean waiting time of

over one year (for domestic firms) reported in 1999. Regarding duty-free concessions, 7 respondents—39% in all—had requests fully approved; 3 had requests partially approved; 3 were not awarded concessions; and 5 await a decision. According to those firms interviewed, requests were granted within 2.1 months, on average, for all clients; within 1.6 months for local firms; and within 4.5 months for foreign investors. Those firms that await a decision claim to have been awaiting an average of 6.8 months for a response. This contrasts notably with the 1999 results, when, in the case of domestic clients, the average time required to receive duty-free concessions was 12.8 months (compared to 4.3 months for foreign investors). Of the firms interviewed that requested other discretionary concessions, 4 respondents, or 31%, were granted their request; 8—representing nearly two-thirds of all respondents—requests are pending; and 1 solicitation was not granted. Approved requests took an average of 3.8 months, with domestic firms claiming an average wait of 3.5 months and foreign investors, 5 months. Surprisingly, those awaiting a decision—which represents the majority of cases—claim to have been waiting an average of 10.8 months. In 1999, the average time to process other discretionary concessions was 11 months for domestic firms and 4 months for foreign companies. The disappearance of the discrepancies between foreign and domestic investors in waiting times since 1999 demonstrates that GO-INVEST has taken considerable measures to ensure equal treatment for both foreign and domestic clients. In fact, most domestic investors now face a shorter waiting period than foreign firms.

- Few local businesses utilized GO-INVEST's web site or printed materials; many noted that they were not aware the agency had a web site. Just 15% of local businesses claim to have visited the web site, and only 5% indicated that they had used GO-INVEST publications. These figures compare to foreign investor utilization rates of 100% and 67% of the web site and written documents, respectively. The low domestic utilization rates indicate the need to better publicize these resources.
- Notwithstanding the improvement in most scores, very few businesses indicated that they had experienced an increase in sales, employment, or exports as a result of GO-INVEST assistance. This fact could be the result of one of three factors: the investments facilitated by GO-INVEST were economically unproductive; the investments are still too new to have generated such benefits; or businesses are unable to calculate these increases.

Nearly every domestic company participating in the survey indicated an interest in participating in focus groups organized by GO-INVEST in the future to discuss the agency's programs and services, and to evaluate methods of improving the efficiency of the organization. Those companies indicating such an interest are listed in Annex D.

## **B. Respondent Characteristics**

As indicated in tables 1 and 2, respondents to the questionnaire represented a wide array of businesses, from small enterprises to large corporations. A majority of small-business



clients were assisted by GO-INVEST in attending trade fairs abroad, whereas most larger companies approached GO-INVEST for support in obtaining land or concessions.

Table 3 indicates that the vast majority of clients serviced by GO-INVEST during 2001 were companies headquartered in Georgetown. Surprisingly, the total number of foreign clients assisted by GO-INVEST in 2001, as well as the number responding to the survey, was substantially lower than in 1999. Possible reason for this could include the 2001 elections and the global economic slowdown or the terrorist attacks of September 11.

The total number of responses to Questions 1 and 2 is less than the total number of respondents given that some companies considered sales and employment figures to be proprietary information.

**Table 1. Number of Staff Employed by Respondent Companies**

Number of Employees	Number	Percent
1-10	18	39%
11-25	12	26%
26-100	5	11%
101-500	7	15%
501-1,000	2	4%
1,001+	2	4%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.		

**Table 2. Annual Sales of Respondent Companies**

2001 Sales (in G\$)	Number	Percent
Less than \$10,000,000	6	21%
\$10,000,001 - \$50,000,000	5	17%
\$50,000,001 - \$100,000,000	4	14%
\$100,000,001 - \$1,000,000,000	7	24%
\$1,000,000,001 - \$5,000,000,000	5	17%
More than \$5,000,000,001	2	7%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.		

**Table 3. Location of Headquarters of Respondent Companies**

Location	Number	Percent
Guyana - Region I	0	0%
Guyana - Region II	0	0%
Guyana - Region III	0	0%
Guyana - Region IV	43	91%
Guyana - Region V	0	0%
Guyana - Region VI	0	0%
Guyana - Region VII	0	0%
Guyana - Region VIII	0	0%
Guyana - Region IX	0	0%
Guyana - Region X	1	2%
Outside of Guyana	3	6%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.		

### C. Sector of Economy Targeted by GO-INVEST Clients

GO-INVEST assisted companies targeting a broad array of economic sectors. The high number of companies targeting the tourism/handicrafts sector is a result of the substantial number of small-scale arts and crafts producers and vendors that GO-INVEST helped to attend trade fairs abroad. The figures in Table IV may surpass the total number of respondents as some investors targeted more than one sector.

**Table 4. Sectors Targeted by Investors Requesting GO-INVEST Assistance**

Target Sector	<i>All Respondents</i>		<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		<i>Foreign Respondents</i>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture/Fishing	10	18%	9	18%	1	17%
Manufacturing	13	24%	12	24%	1	17%
Mining/Forestry	4	7%	3	6%	1	17%
Social Services	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%
Transportation	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%
Tourism/Handicrafts	18	33%	17	35%	1	17%
Telecommunications/IT	3	5%	2	4%	1	17%
Other	4	7%	3	6%	1	17%

Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Respondents marking "Other" listed the energy or printing sectors. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.

### D. Type of Assistance or Information Requested

Although clients requested a range of services from GO-INVEST, there were two areas of particular interest. The most common service provided by GO-INVEST is assisting companies to participate in trade fairs abroad. Additionally, GO-INVEST plays a major role in the facilitation of requests for land/factory space, duty-free concessions, or discretionary concessions. The numbers of clients requesting assistance in attending trade fairs may seem misrepresentative, however, seeing that every respondent to the trade-fair survey was automatically considered to have requested assistance in conducting a mission abroad, in addition to requesting assistance on attending specific trade fairs. In actuality, many of these firms were encouraged by GO-INVEST to attend foreign trade fairs rather than deciding to do so on their own. The survey included these numbers in tracking the types of services requested seeing that, were

any business not interested in attending a trade fair abroad, they would have ignored GO-INVEST's suggestions and not accepted the agency's assistance to attend a trade fair.

It should also be noted that the total number of requests for assistance is far greater than the number of respondents, seeing that GO-INVEST's clients requested, on average, assistance in 4 topics. The relatively high number of requests per client speaks to the image that most investors have of GO-INVEST: that of a one-stop shop for investment.

**Table 5. Export Information/Assistance Requested**

Type of Investment Assistance	<i>All Respondents</i>		<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		<i>Foreign Respondents</i>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Profiles on export opportunities	5	6%	4	5%	1	10%
Steps necessary to export	4	4%	3	4%	1	10%
Macroeconomic data	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Foreign market information	7	8%	5	6%	2	20%
Information on sources of financing	6	7%	5	6%	1	10%
Information on key contact agencies	3	3%	2	3%	1	10%
Information on foreign buyers	6	7%	5	6%	1	10%
Information on trade fairs	27	30%	26	33%	1	10%
Assistance in organizing visit abroad	27	30%	26	33%	1	10%
Information on foreign legal requirements for exporting	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Evaluation of export readiness	1	1%	0	0%	1	10%
Assistance in preparing business or export plan	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Other	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. The respondent marking "Other" requested assistance in international pricing. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.						

**Table 6. Investment Information/Assistance Requested**

<b>Type of Investment Assistance</b>	<i>All Respondents</i>		<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		<i>Foreign Respondents</i>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Profiles on investment opportunities	5	5%	3	4%	2	7%
Steps necessary to commence business operations	6	6%	3	4%	3	11%
Macroeconomic data	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Market information	6	6%	4	6%	2	7%
Information on sources of financing	6	6%	5	7%	1	4%
Information on key contact agencies	5	5%	3	4%	2	7%
Information on legal requirements	10	10%	7	10%	3	11%
Assistance in acquiring work permits	6	6%	4	6%	2	7%
Assistance in preparing business plan	2	2%	1	1%	1	4%
Information on labor laws or wage rates	2	2%	0	0%	2	7%
Sectoral data	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Data on regions	2	2%	1	1%	1	4%
Assistance in acquiring land and/or factory space	13	13%	11	15%	2	7%
Assistance in acquiring duty-free concessions	21	21%	18	25%	3	11%
Assistance in acquiring discretionary concessions	13	13%	10	14%	3	11%
Other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.						

## **E. Quality of Export and Investment Assistance**

The improvement from the 1999 survey in the average score given by respondents when queried about the quality of GO-INVEST's investment and export services is notable. The vast majority of businesses view GO-INVEST as being able to meet most their needs in the provision of both investment and export assistance.<sup>8</sup> Further, most respondents rank GO-INVEST's staff high in terms of professionalism. Regarding the quality of export and investment-related materials, the total number of responses is fewer than for other questions seeing that those businesses that did not utilize any such materials did not answer this question. The one area of

<sup>8</sup> A client is determined to have had its needs met in those cases where the client ranked the quality of GO-INVEST's services as a 1, 2, or 3 on a five-point scale.

relative weakness noted by domestic respondents was GO-INVEST's timeliness in terms of providing investment-related services: only 61% considered the assistance provided in this area to be given in a timely manner.

Separate responses were requested of companies that requested assistance in the areas of investment or exports, given that these functions are handled by distinct staff at GO-INVEST.

**Table 7. Efficiency of Export Information/Assistance Provided**

<i>All Respondents</i>				<i>Domestic Respondents</i>				<i>Foreign Respondents</i>			
<b>Efficient</b>		<b>Inefficient</b>		<b>Efficient</b>		<b>Inefficient</b>		<b>Efficient</b>		<b>Inefficient</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
29	83%	6	17%	27	82%	6	18%	2	100%	0	0%

Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey.

**Table 8. Quality of Export Information/Assistance Provided**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.3)</i>									
7	20%	15	43%	10	29%	3	9%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.3)</i>									
6	18%	15	45%	9	27%	3	9%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.0)</i>									
1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%

Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.

**Table 9. Level of Professionalism of Staff Providing Export Information/Assistance**

Excellent (1)		Above Average (2)		Satisfactory (3)		Inadequate (4)		Poor (5)	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 1.9)</i>									
12	34%	16	46%	5	14%	2	6%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 1.9)</i>									
12	36%	15	45%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.5)</i>									
0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 10. Quality of Available Export-related Resources**

Excellent (1)		Above Average (2)		Satisfactory (3)		Inadequate (4)		Poor (5)	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
8	26%	10	32%	7	23%	6	19%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.3)</i>									
8	28%	9	31%	6	21%	6	21%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.5)</i>									
0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 11. Efficiency of Investment Information/Assistance Provided**

All Respondents				Domestic Respondents				Foreign Respondents			
Efficient		Inefficient		Efficient		Inefficient		Efficient		Inefficient	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
14	67%	7	33%	11	61%	7	39%	3	100%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey.											

**Table 12. Quality of Investment Information/Assistance Provided**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
7	32%	5	23%	6	27%	3	14%	1	5%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
6	32%	4	21%	5	26%	3	16%	1	5%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.0)</i>									
1	33%	1	33%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 13. Level of Professionalism of Staff Providing Investment Information/Assistance**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.2)</i>									
8	35%	8	35%	3	13%	3	13%	1	4%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.3)</i>									
6	30%	8	40%	2	10%	3	15%	1	5%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 1.7)</i>									
2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 14. Quality of Available Investment-related Resources**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
4	25%	6	38%	3	19%	2	13%	1	6%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
3	21%	6	43%	2	14%	2	14%	1	7%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.0)</i>									
1	50%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

#### **F. Quality of Assistance in Helping Clients Obtain Land or Concessions**

Since 1999, the mean score given with regard to the quality of assistance provided by GO-INVEST to investors wishing to acquire land or concessions has increased notably. Further, the timeliness of the decision-making process has been greatly improved, particularly in terms of services provided to domestic clients. However, the information collected concerning GO-INVEST's handling of requests for land or concessions still raises a number of issues. Respondents reacted differently to the question concerning the outcome of requests for land or concessions. Some respondents considered pending request to be partially approved, whereas others considered such requests to be not approved. In effect, both are correct interpretations, and thus the surveyor had to clarify responses to make the responses more useful.

A further problem was encountered by the fact that some respondents felt that a request had been declined when in fact it was under review according to GO-INVEST. Most respondents who had responded in this fashion had not received consistent feedback from GO-INVEST concerning the status of their request. In contrast, some respondents indicated that their request was either pending or had been declined, when GO-INVEST was unaware of any request at all. In these cases, investors considered what in some cases were informal discussions as a request for concessions, but never followed up with GO-INVEST to pursue the request more formally, and thus the request was never processed. Further, a number of investors have not provided the necessary information for a final decision to be made concerning requests for land or concessions. Notwithstanding this point, many such investors still place the blame on GO-



INVEST for the delays in the concession-granting process.<sup>9</sup> Although it behooves investors to be as clear as possible in requesting assistance and to provide all the necessary information required to process requests, GO-INVEST should follow up with every potential request for land or concessions, regardless of where and how the request may arise.

An additional dilemma can be seen in comparing the responses to the questions concerning the status of requests and the status of applications. There were many interpretations of these two questions, although the majority of investors felt that just because a request was approved did not necessarily mean that an application was completed; that is to say, a verbal approval had been given, but final written approval was contingent about the presentation of certain paperwork or completion of specific acts. This is an important indication that the process remains overly complex.

The scores given concerning assistance provided in processing requests for land or concessions are directly correlated to the percentage of investors who had their requests granted. Overall, investors considered the quality of assistance best with regard to the handling of requests for land and worse for the processing of request for other discretionary concessions. The percentage of investors who were granted their request for land, duty-free concessions, and other discretionary concessions was 62%, 39%, and 31%, respectively. The average scores given with regard to assistance in acquiring land, duty-free concessions, and other discretionary concessions was 2.2, 2.4, and 2.6 (all between above average and satisfactory), respectively.

The amount of time required to process requests varied widely, and thus the determination of an average processing time is of limited use. Some investors—most typically large, well-known local businesses—received an approval for their request within a matter of days or weeks, whereas others claim to have been waiting for years to receive a final decision. The wide array of answers concerning timing speaks to the ongoing need to clarify the concessions-granting process to ensure equal treatment of all investors.

The average amount of time taken to grant requests in 2001 was 7.3 months for land; 2.1 months for duty-free concessions; and 3.8 months for other discretionary concessions. Remarkably, foreign investors now claim to have to wait longer to receive a decision than domestic clients. This represents a dramatic change since 1999, when foreigners claimed to receive feedback about twice as quickly as domestic investors.

---

<sup>9</sup> This problem addresses the lack of clarity involved in the current concessions-granting process, where there are is not one established set of procedures or forms to be used in requesting concessions.

**Table 15. Outcome of Requests for Land and/or Factory Space**

Granted		Not Granted		Partially Approved		Pending	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>All Respondents</i>							
8	62%	0	0%	0	0%	5	38%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>							
7	64%	0	0%	0	0%	4	36%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>							
1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.							

**Table 16. Quality of Assistance Concerning Requests for Land and/or Factory Space**

Excellent (1)		Above Average (2)		Satisfactory (3)		Inadequate (4)		Poor (5)	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.2)</i>									
4	31%	2	15%	7	54%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
3	27%	1	9%	7	64%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 1.5)</i>									
1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 17. Status of Applications for Land and/or Factory Space**

<b>Completely Processed</b>		<b>Partially Completed/In Progress</b>		<b>No Response from GO-INVEST</b>		<b>Other</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents</i>							
4	31%	9	69%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>							
4	36%	7	64%	0	0%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>							
0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.							

**Table 18. Average Amount of Time to Process Requests for Land and/or Factory Space**

<i>All Respondents</i>		<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		<i>Foreign Respondents</i>	
<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>
7.3 months	7.0 months	7.3 months	7.3 months	N/A	6.0 months
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey.					

**Table 19. Outcome of Requests for Duty-free Concessions**

<b>Granted</b>		<b>Not Granted</b>		<b>Partially Approved</b>		<b>Pending</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents</i>							
7	39%	3	17%	3	17%	5	28%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>							
6	40%	3	20%	2	13%	4	27%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>							
1	33%	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.							

**Table 20. Quality of Assistance Concerning Requests for Duty-free Concessions**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
5	29%	6	35%	2	12%	3	18%	1	6%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.4)</i>									
5	36%	4	29%	1	7%	3	21%	1	7%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.3)</i>									
0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 21. Status of Applications for Duty-free Concessions**

<b>Completely Processed</b>		<b>Partially Completed/In Progress</b>		<b>No Response from GO-INVEST</b>		<b>Other</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents</i>							
5	29%	11	65%	1	6%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>							
4	29%	9	64%	1	7%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>							
1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.							

**Table 22. Average Amount of Time to Process Requests for Duty-free Concessions**

<i>All Respondents</i>		<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		<i>Foreign Respondents</i>	
<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>
2.1 months	6.8 months	1.6 months	7.0 months	4.5 months	6.0 months
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey.					

**Table 23. Outcome of Requests for Discretionary Concessions**

<b>Granted</b>		<b>Not Granted</b>		<b>Partially Approved</b>		<b>Pending</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents</i>							
4	31%	1	8%	0	0%	8	62%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>							
3	30%	1	10%	0	0%	6	60%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>							
1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.							

**Table 24. Assessment of Assistance Concerning Requests for Discretionary Concessions**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.6)</i>									
2	15%	4	31%	5	38%	1	8%	1	8%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.6)</i>									
2	20%	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 2.7)</i>									
0	0%	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 25. Status of Applications for Discretionary Concessions**

<b>Completely Processed</b>		<b>Partially Completed/In Progress</b>		<b>No Response from GO-INVEST</b>		<b>Other</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents</i>							
2	17%	9	75%	1	8%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>							
1	11%	7	78%	1	11%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>							
1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.							

**Table 26. Average Amount of Time to Process Requests for Discretionary Concessions**

<b>All Respondents</b>		<b>Domestic Respondents</b>		<b>Foreign Respondents</b>	
<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	<b>Completely Processed</b>	<b>Pending</b>
3.8 months	10.8 months	3.5 months	15.5 months	5.0 months	6.0 months
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey.					

**G. Level of Staff Responsiveness**

The tables listed under this section present the frequency of "yes" and "no" answers given by respondents in response to questions concerning staff responsiveness. The high percentage of "yes" answers speaks to the area where GO-INVEST has made the biggest improvements since the 1999 survey: its ability to be responsive to the majority of clients. The lowest frequency of "yes" answers was given in respond to the question "*Did a staff member visit your business?*"; less than half of respondents answered "yes" to this query.

The number of responses to the question "*Did staff follow-up subsequent to your consultation to review results of the assistance?*" is lower than the others because many clients with pending request did not answer this question.

**Table 27. Feedback on Staff Responsiveness**

Question	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>All Respondents</i>				
Did staff devote enough time to your inquiry?	19	83%	4	17%
Did staff respond to your calls or e-mails?	20	87%	3	13%
Did you meet face-to-face with a staff member?	21	91%	2	9%
Did a staff member visit your business?	12	52%	11	48%
Do you know the name of the officer assigned to assist you with your request?	19	83%	4	17%
Did staff follow-up subsequent to your consultation to review results of assistance?	12	63%	7	37%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>				
Did staff devote enough time to your inquiry?	16	80%	4	20%
Did staff respond to your calls or e-mails?	17	85%	3	15%
Did you meet face-to-face with a staff member?	18	90%	2	10%
Did a staff member visit your business?	11	55%	9	45%
Do you know the name of the officer assigned to assist you with your request?	17	85%	3	15%
Did staff follow-up subsequent to your consultation to review results of assistance?	9	56%	7	44%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>				
Did staff devote enough time to your inquiry?	3	100%	0	0%
Did staff respond to your calls or e-mails?	3	100%	0	0%
Did you meet face-to-face with a staff member?	3	100%	0	0%
Did a staff member visit your business?	1	33%	2	66%
Do you know the name of the officer assigned to assist you with your request?	2	66%	1	33%
Did staff follow-up subsequent to your consultation to review results of assistance?	3	100%	0	0%

## H. Use of GO-INVEST Resources

The low number of local respondents claiming to have visited GO-INVEST's web site or read GO-INVEST literature speaks a great deal about the need of the agency to do a better job publicizing these important resources. A common response by domestic investors to the question: "*Did you utilize GO-INVEST's web site?*" was: "GO-INVEST has a web site?" However, seeing that many local investors only wish to interact with GO-INVEST for assistance in acquiring land or concessions, and not to obtain general information, it is uncertain whether local businesses would ever consultant these resources with frequency.

**Table 28. Utilization of Web Site and Printed Materials**

Question	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>All Respondents</i>				
Did you utilize the GO-INVEST web site?	6	26%	17	74%
Did you utilize any GO-INVEST publications?	3	13%	20	87%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>				
Did you utilize the GO-INVEST web site?	3	15%	17	85%
Did you utilize any GO-INVEST publications?	1	5%	19	95%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>				
Did you utilize the GO-INVEST web site?	3	100%	0	0%
Did you utilize any GO-INVEST publications?	2	67%	1	33%

Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey.

## I. Benefits and Effectiveness of Working with GO-INVEST

A vast majority of respondents—94%—rated the overall quality of GO-INVEST services as satisfactory or above. Further, not one respondent rated their interaction with GO-INVEST as poor. This represents a dramatic improvement from the 1999 survey, when two-thirds of local respondents and over 50% of all respondents ranked the agency's services as less than satisfactory. The average score given to GO-INVEST, on a scale from 1 to 5, was 2.0 (above average) overall; 2.0 (above average) for domestic respondents; and 1.7 (between excellent and above average) for foreign respondents.



Overall, there is a direct correlation between the score provided and the outcome of a request for assistance. Those businesses that were granted all the concessions they requested tended to give high marks to GO-INVEST. Those that were not granted concessions tended to give lower marks. Even though several businesses falling into the latter category did not necessarily fault GO-INVEST for not having received the concessions they had received, they did use the outcome of their request as justification to state that the agency was inefficient due to its inability to make its own decisions and ultimately help them receive their concessions.

Interestingly, only half of all respondents indicated that their needs were fully met. However, many investors with pending requests have not yet had their needs met, and thus marked "no" in some cases, although many of these responses would undoubtedly turn to "yes" answers in the future.

The total number of responses for Table 30 does not equal the total number of respondents for two reasons. First, some respondents selected more than one benefit. Second, those investors who are still working with GO-INVEST on their request have not yet received any benefit, although they may in the future. The information in Table 30 is also interesting because of the low number of respondents having indicated an improvement in production, sales or exports as a result of GO-INVEST assistance. Further, none of those few investors that indicated an increase in one of these areas was able to quantify the increase. Either these investments have been economically unproductive; investments were made too recently to have had resulted in an economic benefit; or the investors are unable to evaluate the results of agency assistance. Whatever the precise cause, the responses speak to the need for GO-INVEST to develop better systems for tracking the long-term results of its assistance, since it appears that many of the agency's clients are unable to do so on their own.

The answers presented in Table 32, which present "yes" and "no" responses to the question "*Would you use GO-INVEST's services again?*", are not entirely representative of respondent sentiments. As noted by several respondents giving GO-INVEST low marks, they would prefer not to work with the agency, but have no choice if they are to ask for concessions or land. Thus, several respondents gave a qualified "yes" answer.

**Table 29. Ability of GO-INVEST to meet client needs**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents</i>		
<b>Met Needs</b>	11	52%
<b>Did Not Meet Needs</b>	4	19%
<b>Partially Met Needs</b>	6	29%
<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		
<b>Met Needs</b>	9	50%
<b>Did Not Meet Needs</b>	4	22%
<b>Partially Met Needs</b>	5	28%
<i>Foreign Respondents</i>		
<b>Met Needs</b>	2	67%
<b>Did Not Meet Needs</b>	0	0%
<b>Partially Met Needs</b>	1	33%
Note: This table does not include responses to the trade-fair survey.		

**Table 30. Benefits of GO-INVEST Assistance**

<b>Type of Investment Assistance</b>	<i>All Respondents</i>		<i>Domestic Respondents</i>		<i>Foreign Respondents</i>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Received duty-free concessions	11	7%	9	7%	2	15%
Received discretionary concessions	5	3%	3	2%	2	15%
Received land and/or factory space	11	7%	10	7%	1	8%
Identified new customers	21	15%	21	16%	0	0%
Identified new business partner	13	9%	11	8%	2	15%
Identified new export market	17	11%	17	13%	0	0%
Identified new domestic product market	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Better understanding of business regulations	3	2%	1	1%	2	15%
Assisted in participating in business visit abroad	24	16%	24	18%	0	0%
Assisted in preparing business, investment or export plan	1	1%	0	0%	1	8%
Assisted in accessing Caribbean Export Development Agency financing	9	6%	9	6%	0	0%
Assisted in accessing European Union Business Assistance Scheme financing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Assisted in accessing other source of financing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Better understanding of export potential	18	12%	18	13%	0	0%
Better understanding of domestic market potential	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Started new local business	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Began exporting	2	1%	2	1%	0	0%
Increased production	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Increased exports	5	3%	5	4%	0	0%
Increased sales	1	1%	0	0%	1	8%
Increased employment	2	1%	1	1%	1	8%
None/request pending	1	1%	0	0%	1	8%
Other	3	2%	3	2%	0	0%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Those respondents indicating "Other" noted an improved knowledge of business management.						

**Table 31. Overall Score Given to GO-INVEST**

<b>Excellent (1)</b>		<b>Above Average (2)</b>		<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>		<b>Inadequate (4)</b>		<b>Poor (5)</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<i>All Respondents (Mean Score = 2.0)</i>									
17	36%	15	32%	12	26%	3	6%	0	0%
<i>Domestic Respondents (Mean Score = 2.0)</i>									
15	34%	15	34%	11	25%	3	7%	0	0%
<i>Foreign Respondents (Mean Score = 1.7)</i>									
2	67%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey. Figures may not equal 100% due to rounding.									

**Table 32. Desire to Work with GO-INVEST Again**

<i>All Respondents</i>				<i>Domestic Respondents</i>				<i>Foreign Respondents</i>			
<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>		<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
46	98%	1	2%	43	98%	1	2%	3	100%	0	0%
Note: This table includes responses to the trade-fair survey.											

## V. Respondent Commentary

When given the opportunity, most companies participating in the survey provided positive feedback about GO-INVEST. Without question, the most frequently voiced comment was the drastic improvement in GO-INVEST services since a new CEO was named in 2001. Many respondents noted that GO-INVEST's investment officers appear to be much more efficient and responsive since the change in GO-INVEST leadership. Even certain businesses that did not receive timely assistance or did not receive the concessions they had requested noted that, notwithstanding the lack of results in their cases, they appreciated the attention the CEO and his staff had given to their request. As one such respondent noted: "At least they tried to help."

Although still in need of improvement, the responsiveness exhibited by GO-INVEST at present is drastically better than it was in the recent past. It appears that this factor more than any other is the cause for the notable jump in positive feedback given by respondents from the 1999 client survey. Companies appreciate the fact that GO-INVEST responds to their requests, in many cases provides updates, and makes a concerted effort not to prejudice any request for assistance, as was common practice in the past at GO-INVEST. When asked about the change in responsiveness at GO-INVEST during the past year, one respondent noted that GO-INVEST used to stand for the statement most businesses felt that GO-INVEST had in mind when responding to requests for assistance: "Go invest somewhere else." This same respondent, who admitted to having given up on the organization in the past, noted that he is now extremely pleased with the attention provided by GO-INVEST to his requests, and will continue to solicit the agency's assistance in the future.

A large number of respondents noted satisfaction with the professional nature of GO-INVEST staff. Further, several companies noted that they were pleased with the proactive attitude exhibited by staff, and the willingness of the agency's staff to make recommendations in areas that were not requested by the client. This is particularly notable considering that a key problem highlighted in the 1999 client survey was the lack of professionalism of GO-INVEST personnel.

Even though GO-INVEST's client satisfaction rating has increased dramatically since 1999, most companies still offered a number of suggestions when asked how GO-INVEST could continue to improve its services. It is strongly recommended that GO-INVEST focus on making these improvements, for it is very likely that the relatively high satisfaction rate demonstrated in the 2001 survey is in part a result of a "honeymoon factor." That is to say, most respondents appear to be happy with GO-INVEST not necessarily because the agency offers flawless services, but simply because the agency responded to clients so poorly in the past that it was impossible not to have done a better job and thus witness a dramatic increase in client satisfaction. However, as clients become accustomed to the level of service that is currently being provided by the agency, they will in time grow impatient with any problems they encounter, even if these problems are relatively miniscule compared with the larger problems faced when interacting with GO-INVEST in the past. A growing number of complaints in the near

future should not necessarily be viewed by GO-INVEST as a negative development: it is a natural turn of events for any maturing organization. In effect, such a “downswing” in opinions in the future might mean that GO-INVEST’s clients are demanding more from the agency, because they feel that GO-INVEST is able to provide top-quality assistance. The key challenge for GO-INVEST is to remain responsive to the feedback of its clients, and focus on continuously improving the quality of its services.

Interestingly enough, most of the 2001 client recommendations concerning needed improvements are the same as those suggestions made during the 1999 survey. This factor is one issue helping to justify the “honeymoon factor” highlighted above; that is to say, even though the recommendations are similar in both the 1999 and 2001 surveys, the overall scores given to GO-INVEST have improved dramatically in two years.

The key suggestions made by respondents are highlighted below:

- Strengthen GO-INVEST’s mandate with relation to other Government ministries, particularly concerning its role in awarding concessions and land. Although some investors suggested the need to build a stronger rapport with officials at the Ministry of Finance, most respondents who suggested this improvement felt it necessary to empower GO-INVEST to be able to make independent decisions regarding concessions and land. This recommendation was repeated more than any other, and was specifically noted by nearly half of all respondents. Even respondents who were pleased with the services provided by GO-INVEST suggested the need to make this change.
- Continue to improve the timeliness and responsiveness of staff. Even though many respondents noted that GO-INVEST had improved in this regard, it remains a key area of concern for many clients.
- Provide more frequent updates to those businesses waiting for decisions concerning requests for land or concessions.
- Ensure that clients are provided with lease paperwork in a timely manner, particularly for factory space at Eccles.
- Indicate to those businesses not receiving land or concessions why their requests were not approved.
- Hire additional employees to assist overworked staff. Related to the above suggestions, many businesses feel that GO-INVEST cannot improve its efficiency and responsiveness unless it is able to hire additional investment officers. Many businesses noted that it is evident that GO-INVEST staff are stretched too thin.
- Hold periodic meetings with investors to discuss major issues and to address possible changes in GO-INVEST’s services.

- Develop better investor-targeting programs to attract high-quality foreign investment to Guyana.
- Improve GO-INVEST's physical layout, including refurbishing the outside of the building and making the lobby area a useful space offering electronic and written information for investors.

In addition to the recommendations highlighted above, those companies responding to the trade-fair survey made the following recommendations:

- Provide businesses with an annual calendar of trade fairs early each year, preferably through one or more public seminars hosted by GO-INVEST. This would enable businesses to plan much further ahead for those fairs they wish to attend. Also, and perhaps more importantly, this practice would allow businesses to apply for Caribbean Export Development Agency (CEDA) financing early in the year, rather than waiting until after they have attended a specific trade fair. A large number of respondents noted that they have been unable to access CEDA financing because CEDA's annual exporters' fund was empty by the time they had received the paperwork from GO-INVEST to fill out and present to CEDA. Many noted that their counterparts in countries such as Jamaica decide early in the year which trade fairs they will attend, and immediately request pre-approval for CEDA financing. Respondents felt that they would be able to act similarly, and thus attend more trade fairs, if GO-INVEST were to provide more timely information on upcoming trade fairs, and be more supportive in the completion of documentation required by CEDA for financing.
- Provide better information on the countries that are hosting trade fairs that GO-INVEST clients are attending. Many respondents noted that they were unable to respond to the needs of many clients because of the drastically different business culture faced in foreign markets.
- Assist businesses attending trade fairs in being able to accept credit-card purchases. Several respondents noted that they were unable to make sales at trade fairs due to their inability to accept credit card payments, which they did not expect to have to deal with due to the low levels of credit-card utilization in Guyana. Several businesses suggested that GO-INVEST arrange to provide a credit-card payment facility at trade fairs that all Guyanese attendees could utilize for accepting payments.
- Help reduce costs of transporting goods to trade fairs faced by businesses, by negotiating lower air transport rates with.
- Help arrange meetings with potential business partners at trade fairs.
- Assist trade-fair attendees in avoiding banking fees associated with cashiers checks by arranging for bulk payment of booth costs at fairs for all participants.

## Annex A: 2001 Client Satisfaction Questionnaire

**GUYANA OFFICE FOR INVESTMENT (GO-INVEST)**  
**2001 CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY**

*This survey is being conducted by USAID/GEO on behalf of GO-INVEST, and is aimed at determining the areas where improvement are needed, in order to enable this agency to provide an efficient and effective service to its clients. The assurance is given that all information being requested will be treated with strictest confidence and in no event will be used for any purpose other than that for which it is intended.*

1. Name of Company: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Address (Headquarters): \_\_\_\_\_
3. Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Fax: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Email: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Name & Title: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Company Size:
  - A. Number of Employees \_\_\_\_\_
  - B. Annual sales (please specify sales period) \_\_\_\_\_
8. What is the specific nature of your Company's business activities?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
9. What sector of the economy was targeted by your company in its request for assistance from GO-INVEST?
 

Agriculture/Fishing	Transportation/Logistics
Manufacturing/Construction	Tourism/Entertainment/Handicrafts
Mining/Forestry	Telecommunications/IT
Social Services/Housing/Health	Other (Specify) _____



**10. Which of the following services did you require from GO-INVEST? (Tick one or more as appropriate)**

Export Information (please specify the types of assistance required):

- i) Profiles on export opportunities
- ii) Steps necessary to export
- iii) Macro-economic data/information
- iv) Foreign market information
- v) Information on possible sources of financing (loans and grants)
- vi) Information on key contact agencies and individuals (domestic or foreign)
- vii) Information on foreign buyers/importers
- viii) Information on trade fairs or expositions
- ix) Assistance in organizing or participating in a visit or mission abroad
- x) Information on foreign legal/regulatory requirements for exporting
- xi) Evaluation of export readiness
- xii) Assistance in preparing business or export plan
- xiii) Other \_\_\_\_\_

Investment Information (please specify the types of assistance required):

- i) Profiles on investment opportunities in Guyana
- ii) Steps necessary to commence business in Guyana
- iii) Macro-economic data/information
- iv) Market information
- v) Information on possible sources of financing (loans and grants)
- vi) Information on key contact agencies and individuals
- vii) Information on legal/regulatory requirements for business and investment in Guyana
- viii) Information or assistance in acquiring work permits
- ix) Assistance in preparing business or investment plan
- x) Wage rates and/or labor law information
- xi) Sectoral data
- xii) Relevant data on Regions and/or micro regions
- xiii) Assistance in the acquisition of land and/or factory space
- xiv) Assistance in the acquisition of duty-free concessions
- xv) Assistance in the acquisition of discretionary concessions
- xvi) Other \_\_\_\_\_

**11. Please assess the of quality of services provided by GO-INVEST:**

Services Provided	<u>Were services provided in an efficient and timely manner?</u>  1. Yes 2. No	<u>How would you rate the quality of the services provided?</u> 1. Excellent 2. Above Average 3. Satisfactory 4. Inadequate 5. Poor	<u>How would you rate the level of professionalism of staff and the resources available for providing the services?</u>  1. Excellent                      4. Inadequate 2. Above Average              5. Poor 3. Satisfactory		<b>Remarks</b> (Including suggested reasons for possible delays or quality of service provided)
			Professionalism of staff	Available resources	
<b>Export Information</b>					
<b>Investment Information</b>					

**12. Please assess the timeliness and the quality of the decision-making process regarding the requests for land and concessions (please skip if not applicable).**

Requests	<u>Was your request for Land/Factory Space, Duty-Free Concessions and/or Discretionary Concessions approved?</u>  1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially	<u>How would you rate the quality of the assistance provided? (state reasons in the Remarks column)</u>  1. Excellent 2. Above Average 3. Satisfactory 4. Inadequate 5. Poor	<u>What is the current status of your proposal/application?</u>  1. Completely processed 2. Partially completed 3. No response from GO-INVEST 4. Other (specify)	<u>If completely processed</u>  How many working days did it take for the process to be completed (from the date of first contact with GO-INVEST)?	<u>If not completely processed</u>  How many working days have elapsed since your application was made?	Remarks
Land or Factory Space						
Duty-Free Concessions						
Discretionary Concessions						

**13. How helpful was GO-INVEST staff? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

- A. Did staff devote enough time to your inquiry?
- Yes      No
- B. Did staff respond to your calls or e-mails?
- Yes      No
- C. Did you have a face-to-face meeting with a staff member?
- Yes      No
- D. Did a staff member visit your business premises?
- Yes      No
- E. Do you know the name of the officer assigned to your request for assistance?
- Yes      No
- F. Did staff follow-up subsequently to review the results of your consultation with GO-INVEST?
- Yes      No

**14. Were GO-INVEST's resources useful? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

- A. Did you visit the Go-Invest web site?

Yes      No

If yes, please provide your impressions of the web site:

---

---

---

B. Did you utilize any GO-INVEST publications?

Yes                  No

If yes, please list which publications you used and what your impressions of them were:

---



---

15. Overall, was GO-INVEST able to meet your needs? (Please tick or circle one response.)

Yes                          No                          Partially

16. What have been the benefits to your firm of assistance provided by GO-INVEST? (Tick one or more as appropriate.)

- i) Received duty-free concessions
- ii) Received discretionary concessions
- iii) Acquired land and/or factory space
- iv) Identified new business partner (in Guyana or abroad)
- v) Identified new export market
- vi) Identified new domestic product market
- vii) Better understanding of business regulations (labor, environment, etc.)
- viii) Assisted in organizing or participating in business visit abroad
- ix) Assisted in preparing business, investment or export plan
- x) Assisted in accessing financing
- xi) Better understanding of export potential
- xii) Better understanding of domestic market potential
- xiii) Started new local business
- xiv) Began exporting
- xv) Increased production (please quantify, if possible): \_\_\_\_\_
- xvi) Increased exports (please quantify, if possible): \_\_\_\_\_
- xvii) Increased sales (please quantify, if possible): \_\_\_\_\_
- xviii) Increased employment (please quantify, if possible): \_\_\_\_\_
- xix) Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

- 17. Did you require any services that were not provided by GO-INVEST?  
(Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes                      No

If Yes, please elaborate: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- 18. What were the best aspects of your interaction with GO-INVEST?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- 19. What areas of improvement are required to enable GO-INVEST to better serve its clients?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- 20. Overall, how would you rank your interaction with GO-INVEST?**

- i)            Very valuable                      (1)
- ii)          Above expectations            (2)
- iii)        Satisfactory                        (3)
- iv)         Below expectations            (4)
- v)          A waste of time                    (5)

- 21. Would you use GO-INVEST's services again? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes                  No

If No, please specify why not: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

- 22. Would you be interested in participating in a focus group convened to discuss improvements at GO-INVEST? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes                  No

- 23. In the case of any outstanding problems, would you like your contact information and problems to be shared with GO-INVEST so that it may address these problems directly? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes                  No

- 24. Please provide any other comments you may have.**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

*Thank you for assisting in this important effort to continuously improve GO-INVEST's services.*

**Annex B      2001 Client Satisfaction Questionnaire for Trade Fair Attendees**

**GUYANA OFFICE FOR INVESTMENT (GO-INVEST)  
2001 CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY**

*This survey is being conducted by USAID/GEO on behalf of GO-INVEST, and is aimed at determining the areas where improvement are needed, in order to enable this agency to provide an efficient and effective service to its clients. The assurance is given that all information being requested will be treated with strictest confidence and in no event will be used for any purpose other than that for which it is intended.*

1.    **Name of Company:** \_\_\_\_\_
2.    **Address (Headquarters):** \_\_\_\_\_
3.    **Telephone:** \_\_\_\_\_ **4. Fax:** \_\_\_\_\_
5.    **Email:** \_\_\_\_\_
6.    **Name & Title:** \_\_\_\_\_
7.    **Company Size:**
  - A.    Number of Employees \_\_\_\_\_
  - B.    Annual sales (please specify sales period) \_\_\_\_\_
8.    **What is the specific nature of your Company's business activities?**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



**9. Which trade fair(s)/exposition(s) did GO-INVEST help you attend? (Tick one or more as appropriate.)**

- i) AmazonTech
- ii) Caribbean Gift & Craft Show
- iii) Caribbean Expo
- iv) Canadian National Exhibition
- v) Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Please assess the quality of services provided by GO-INVEST.**

<u>Were services provided in an efficient and timely manner?</u>	<u>How would you rate the quality of the services provided?</u>	<u>How would you rate the level of professionalism of staff and the resources available for providing the services?</u>		<b>Remarks</b> (Including suggested reasons for quality of service provided)
1. Yes 2. No	1. Excellent 2. Above Average 3. Satisfactory 4. Inadequate 5. Poor	1. Excellent 2. Above Average 3. Satisfactory	4. Inadequate 5. Poor	
		<i>Professionalism of staff</i>	<i>Available Resources</i>	

**11. What have been the benefits of your attendance at the trade fair(s)/exposition(s) indicated under question 9? (Tick one or more as appropriate.)**

- i) Identified new business partner
- ii) Identified new customers
- iii) Identified new export market
- iv) Better understanding of export potential
- v) Began exporting
- vi) Accessed Caribbean Export Development Agency financing
- vii) Accessed European Union Business Assistance Scheme financing
- viii) Accessed other source of financing (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ix) Increased exports (please quantify, if possible): \_\_\_\_\_
- x) Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

- 12. What improvement could GO-INVEST have made in the assistance it provided?**

---

---

---

- 13. Would you use GO-INVEST's services again in the future? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes              No

If No, please specify why not: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

- 14. Would you be interested in participating in a focus group convened to discuss possible improvements at GO-INVEST? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes              No

- 15. In the case of any outstanding problems, would you like your contact information and problems to be shared with GO-INVEST so that GO-INVEST may address these problems directly? (Please tick or circle yes or no.)**

Yes              No

- 16. Please provide any other comments you may have.**

---

---

---

*Thank you for assisting in this important effort to continuously improve GO-INVEST's services.*

### **Annex C      Specific Follow-up Items Requested by Respondents**

The following table lists those pending items that respondents specifically requested be presented to GO-INVEST, so that the agency could follow up with the company on each issue.

<b>Company</b>	<b>Assistance Requested of GO-INVEST</b>
Guyana Stockfeeds Inc.	Would like to know the status of request for land.
Liz Unique Handicraft	Two years ago some Guyanese businesses attended a trade fair in Martinique, but did not pay for their booths. As a result, the trade fair will not let Guayanese businesses attend the fair. Would like to discuss ways that GO-INVEST could help fix this problem.
A Mazaharally & Sons	Requested a number of concessions in the past, and GO-INVEST never followed up.
Genesis of Craft	Would like assistance in developing and sourcing plastic bags that have company information printed on them.
Sheik Hassan Productions	Is awaiting lease paperwork for land granted at Eccles, without which he has been unable to apply for a bank loan.
T-Divya & Son's Trading Construction Service	Would like GO-INVEST to expedite issuance of lease papers for land he received at Eccles. He would also like to discuss a request for duty-free concessions.
Deltech International	President Mohamed Rahman, located in Texas, is a certified small-business government contractor. If GO-INVEST were interested, he would be happy to share his experiences so that the agency could institute similar procurement programs in Guyana.

## **Annex D      List of Respondents Interested in Participating in Focus Groups on GO-INVEST Services**

The following companies indicated an interest in participating in GO-INVEST focus groups organized to discuss the agency's services, including possible improvements.

<b>Company</b>	<b>Contact</b>
<b>Respondents to Full Questionnaire</b>	
Pritipaul Singh Investments	Ronald Deen
Guyana Stockfeeds Ltd.	Robert Badal
Ceramin Ltd.	Roshnan Habibullah
Bulkan Timber Works Inc.	Howard Bulkan
A Mazaharally & Sons	Yacoob Mazaharally
Atlantic Natural Oils Inc.	Osmond Davy
Wray's Enterprise	Mervyn Wray
K.P. Seepersaud Enterprises	K.P. Seepersaud
Super-Crete Concrete Block Works	Farouk Hussein
Sheik Hassan Productions	Sheik Hassan
Asha Kissoon-Roberts	AH&L Kissoon HH
Coverden Fisheries	Joseph Bhaskaram
T-Divya & Son's Trading Construction Service	Tolsie Ram Persaud
Goldfield Inc	Gobin Dwarka
Alesie Guyana	Shevon Lord
Deltech International	Mohamed Rahman
<b>Respondents to Trade-Fair Questionnaire</b>	
Belle's Leather Establishment	Malcolm Belle
Eldorado Skipper Jewelry	Rupraj Bridjmohan
Deane-Hughes Design	Elizabeth Deane-Hughes
Cole Facts	Michelle Cole
Genesis of Craft	Kevin Hinckson
Joy's Craft	Jo-Ann Goring
Eddie Craft	Edward Luke-King
Liz Unique Handicraft	Fitzpatrick Gibson
Newton's Art & Craft	Leona Newton
Dynamic Art & Craft	Richard Ousman
D&R Wooden Craft	Denzil Hollingsworth
Sococo Inc.	K. Somasegaram
Amazon Caribbean Guyana Ltd.	Xavier Richard
Samuel's Wicker, Rattan & Upholstery Works	Praimroop Persaud
Yon's Kids Wear	Yonette Patterson
Cummings Leather Establishment	Roy Cummings

## **Annex E      Recommended Questionnaire Changes for Future GO-INVEST Client Surveys**

Should additional GO-INVEST client surveys be conducted in the future, certain changes in the 2001 questionnaires are necessary to ensure that more useful information can be gathered.

### **A.      Recommended Changes in Full Survey**

Changes recommended in the full survey are highlighted below:

- For all questions asking for either a "yes" or "no" ranking, or requesting a numerical rank, an "unable to answer/not applicable" option should be added
- Option three on Question 9 should be changed from "Mining" to "Mining/Forestry."
- Question 11 should be altered to read as follows:

Service(s) Provided	Were services provided in an efficient and timely manner?	How would you rank the level of professionalism of GO-INVEST staff?	How would you rank the quality of written or electronic resources made available to you?	How would you rate the overall quality of services provided?
	--Yes (1) --No (2) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (3)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)
Export Information				
Investment Information				

- Question 12, concerning the status of requests for land or concessions, did not include an option for pending requests. Thus, when asked if a concession had been granted, some respondents marked "no," while others marked "partially." Further, the questions concerning whether requests had been approved and what the status of the application(s) was/were, both of which were included in the 1999 survey, seemed to be open to interpretation by respondents. Some felt that the question concerning status meant the same as a "yes" answer to the question of whether concessions were granted, whereas others used the status question to indicate instances where concessions were granted verbally, but the final paperwork had not been provided. To clarify whether a request was pending or had been declined, answers were clarified with respondents and GO-INVEST. It is recommended that Question 20, which was the same in the 1999 and 2001 surveys, be revised in the future as follows:

Request(s)	What is the status of your request for land/factory space, duty-free concessions, and/or discretionary concessions?	How would you rate the quality of assistance provided by GO-INVEST?	For approved requests, how long did it take to receive an approval?	For pending requests, how much time has elapsed since you first made your request?	Remarks (including any pending items for approved requests, such as lease documents or signed concession letters).
	--Completely approved (1) --Partially approved (2) --Request under review (3) --Denied (4)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)			
Land or Factory Space					
Duty-free Concessions					
Discretionary Concessions					

Even with the above clarifications to Question 12, there would still exist the problems highlighted under Section IV.E, namely because many investors are not sure if a request is still pending or has been rejected due to lack of consistent GO-INVEST feedback in certain cases.

- Question 15 should be eliminated, seeing that it is the same as Question 17. Question 17 is more useful in that it both asks whether GO-INVEST was able to meet all of the clients needs and asks for clarification in the case of "no" answers.
- For Question 16, which asks for feedback on the benefits resulting from GO-INVEST assistance, the following option should be added: *None/Request Pending*.
- Question 20 could have led to unusually high marks, due to the phrases "above expectations" and "below expectations." Given that GO-INVEST's services were so poor in the past, a particularly large percentage of respondents would naturally consider their most recent interaction with the agency to be above expectations. However, in posing this question during face-to-face interviews, the question was modified such that the terms "above expectations" and "below expectations" were replaced with "above average" and "below average," respectively. In a sense, this question also repeats Question 11, although Question 20 was included so that companies requesting numerous services could provide one over-arching score for GO-INVEST. For future surveys, it may be useful to remove this question to avoid repetition.
- Question 23 should be revised to read as follows: *If you have indicated in this survey that you have a pending issue or problem with GO-INVEST, would you like to have your contact information and problem shared with GO-INVEST so that the agency may follow-up with you immediately to discuss the issue or problem?* This clarification is needed because most respondents apparently thought the question was open-ended, and referred to any problem the respondent may confront in the future, whereas the true purpose of the question was to

compile a list of companies wishing to be contacted immediately in order to resolve outstanding problems.

## **B. Recommended Changes in Trade-Fair Survey**

Some minor changes are also recommended in the trade-fair survey, as indicated below:

- Question 10 should be revised in a fashion similar to the changes recommended in Question 11 of the full survey.
- The revised Question 10 in the trade-fair survey should thus read as follows:

Were services provided in an efficient and timely manner?	How would you rank the level of professionalism of GO-INVEST staff?	How would you rank the quality of written or electronic resources made available to you?	How would you rate the overall quality of services provided?
--Yes (1) --No (2) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (3)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)	--Excellent (1) --Above Average (2) --Average (3) --Below Average (4) --Poor (5) --Unable to Answer/ Not Applicable (6)

- The following option should be added to Question 11: *None/Request Pending*.
- Question 12 should be replaced by Questions 18 and 19 from the full survey.
- Question 15 should be revised to read as follows: *If you have indicated in this survey that you have a pending issue or problem with GO-INVEST, would you like to have your contact information and problem shared with GO-INVEST so that the agency may follow-up with you immediately to discuss the issue or problem?*